arXiv:1112.3408v2 [math.CA] 29 Jul 2012

Hyperbolic Orbits for a Class of Singular Hamiltonian Systems*

Donglun Wu and Shiqing Zhang
Yangtze Center of Mathematics and College of Mathematics, Sichuan University,
Chengdu 610064, People's Republic of China

Abstract The existence of hyperbolic orbits is proved for a class of singular Hamiltonian systems $\ddot{u}(t) + \nabla V(u(t)) = 0$ by taking limit for a sequence of periodic solutions which are the variational minimizers of Lagrangian actions.

Keywords Hyperbolic Orbits; Variational Methods; Singular Hamiltonian Systems.

2000 MSC: 34C15, 34C25, 58F

1 Introduction and Main Results

In this paper, we consider the following second order Hamiltonian systems

$$\ddot{u}(t) + \nabla V(u(t)) = 0 \tag{1}$$

with

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot{u}(t)|^2 + V(u(t)) = H. \tag{2}$$

where $u \in (R^1, R^N)$, $V \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$ has a singularity at the origin. Subsequently, $\nabla V(x)$ denotes the gradient with respect to the x variable, $(\cdot,\cdot) : R^N \times R^N \to R$ denotes the standard Euclidean inner product in R^N and $|\cdot|$ is the induced norm.

The periodic and homoclinic orbits of Hamiltonian systems have been studied by many mathematicians [1-12, 14-17] and the references therein. Specially, the n-body-type problem is a Hamiltonian system which has attracted some mathematicians to use variational methods to study the parabolic and hyperbolic orbits [3, 7, 12, 22]. Referring to the two-body problem, with a center potential $V(x) = -\dfrac{1}{|x|}$, it is well known that

(i). If H<0, the solution for systems (1) and (2) is an elliptic orbit;

(ii). If H=0, the solution for systems (1) and (2) is a parabolic orbit;

(iii). If H>0, the solution for systems (1) and (2) is a hyperbolic orbit.

Where the parabolic and hyperbolic orbits mean:

Definition 1.0.([3]) If when $|t| \to +\infty$ we have

$$|u(t)| \to +\infty, |\dot{u}(t)| \to 0,$$

then we call $u(t)$ is a parabolic orbit;

If when $|t| \to +\infty$, we have

---

*Supported partially by NSF (11071175) of China.

$$|u(t)| \to +\infty, |\dot{u}(t)| > 0,$$

then we call $u(t)$ is a hyperbolic orbit.

In the above two cases, the parabolic and hyperbolic orbits are all called hyperbolic-like orbits by Felmer and Tanaka in [7]. Subsequently, an orbit is said to be a parabolic or a hyperbolic orbit, if it satisfies

$$|u(t)| \to \infty \quad \text{as} \quad t \to \pm\infty. \tag{3}$$

In 2000, for $N = 2$, Felmer and Tanaka proved that

Theorem 1.1(See[7]). *Assume that $N = 2$ and the following conditions hold*

(A_1) $V \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$,
(A_2) $V(x) \leq 0$ *for all* $x \in R^N \setminus \{0\}$,
(A_3) *there are constants* $\zeta > 2$, $\rho > 0$ *and* $d_0 > 0$ *such that*

$$(i). \; -V(x) \geq \frac{d_0}{|x|^\zeta} \quad for \;\; 0 < |x| \leq \rho,$$
$$(ii). \; (x, \nabla V(x)) + 2V(x) \to +\infty \;\; as \; |x| \to 0.$$

(A_4) *there exist* $\beta > 2$ *and* $C_0 > 0$ *such that*

$$-V(x) \leq \frac{C_0}{|x|^\beta} \quad and \quad |\nabla V(x)| \leq \frac{C_0}{|x|^{\beta+1}} \quad for \;\; |x| \geq 1.$$

Then for any given $H > 0$, θ_+, $\theta_- \in R$ *with* $\theta_+ - \theta_- > \pi$, *there exists a solution* $u(t) = r(t)(\cos\theta(t), \sin\theta(t))$ *of* $(1) - (2)$*such that* $\theta(t) \to \theta_\pm$ *as* $t \to \pm\infty$.

For $N \geq 3$, they proved that

Theorem 1.2(See[7]) *Assume* $N \geq 3$ *and* $(A_1) - (A_4)$ *hold. Then for any given* $H > 0$ *and* $\theta_+ \neq -\theta_-$, *there exists a solution* $u(t)$ *of* $(1) - (2)$ *such that*

$$\lim_{t\to\pm\infty} \frac{u(t)}{|u(t)|} = \theta_\pm,$$

where θ_+, $\theta_- \in S^{N-1} = \{x \in R^N | |x| = 1\}$ are the asymptotic direction for the solution $u(t)$.

In 2011, Zhang in [22] proved the existence of the odd symmetric parabolic or hyperbolic orbit for the restricted 3-body problems with weak forces. He proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3(See[22]) *Suppose that the potential* $V(x)$ *has the following form*

$$V(x) = -\frac{1}{(|x|^2 + r^2)^{\kappa/2}},$$

where $\kappa \in (0, 2)$ *and* $r > 0$. *Then there exists one odd parabolic or hyperbolic orbit for system* $(1) - (2)$, *which minimizes the corresponding variational functional.*

In Theorem 1.3, the potential $V(x)$ has no singularity. When $V(x)$ is of class C^2, by taking the limit for a sequence of break orbits, Serra [16] obtained the existence of at least one homoclinic orbit $u(t)$ at infinity, which means that

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{t\to\pm\infty} |u(t)| = +\infty \\ \lim_{t\to\pm\infty} \dot{u}(t) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Serra proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.4(See[16]) *Suppose* $V \in C^2(R^N, R^1)$ *and satisfies*

(D_1) $V(x) < 0$ *for all* $x \in R^N$,
(D_2) *there exist* $R_0 > 0$ *and* $p > 2$ *such that*

$$V(x) = -\frac{1}{|x|^p} + W(x) \quad \textit{for all} \quad |x| \geq R_0, \quad \textit{with } W \textit{ satisfying}$$

(D_3) $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} W(x)|x|^p = 0$
(D_4) $(x, \nabla W(x)) > 0$ *for all* $|x| \geq R_0$.

Then there exists at least one solution satisfying (4) *for systems* $(1)-(2)$ *with* $H = 0$.

Motivated by above papers, we study systems $(1) - (2)$, under some weaker assumptions about the singularity for the potential, we obtain the hyperbolic orbits with $H > 0$. Precisely, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5 *Suppose that* $V \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$ *satisfies*

(V_1) $V(-x) = V(x)$, $\forall x \in R^N \setminus \{0\}$,

(V_2) $V(x) < 0$, $\forall x \in R^N \setminus \{0\}$,

(V_3) $2V(x) + (x, \nabla V(x)) \to 0$ *as* $|x| \to +\infty$,

(V_4) $2V(x) + (x, \nabla V(x)) \to +\infty$ *as* $|x| \to 0$,

(V_5) $-V(x) \to +\infty$ *as* $|x| \to 0$,

(V_6) $V(x) \to 0$ *as* $|x| \to +\infty$.

Then for any $H > 0$, *there is at least one hyperbolic orbit for systems* $(1) - (2)$.

Notice that the potential V has no strong control at infinity even though it satisfies (V_3) and (V_6). Under some additional conditions, we can get the asymptotic direction of the solution at infinity. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.6 *Suppose that* $V \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$ *satisfies* (V_1)–(V_6) *and the following conditions*

(V_7) *there exist constants* $\beta > 1$, $M_0 > 0$ *and* $r_0 \geq 1$ *such that*

$$|x|^{\beta+1}|\nabla V(x)| \leq M_0, \quad |x|^{\beta+1}|V(x)| \leq M_0 \quad \textit{for all} \quad |x| \geq r_0.$$

Then for any $H > 0$, *there is at least one hyperbolic orbit for systems* $(1) - (2)$ *which has the given asymptotic direction at infinity.*

Remark 1 Notice that if $V(x) = -\frac{1}{|x|^\alpha}$ $(\alpha > 2)$, then V satisfies (V_1)–(V_6). It is easy to check that our hypotheses are weaker than Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. Moreover, there are functions which satisfy our hypotheses of Theorem 1.5 and Theorem

1.6 but not (A_3). For example, let

$$V(x) = \begin{cases} -\dfrac{\ln(|x|^2 + |x|^{-2})}{|x|^2} & \text{for } |x| \le 1, \\ J(x) & \text{for } 1 \le |x| \le 2, \\ -\dfrac{1}{|x|^3} & \text{for } |x| \ge 2, \end{cases}$$

where $J(x) \in C^1(R^N, R^1)$ such that $V(x) \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$. The important difference between our theorems and Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1.4 is that we have singularities in Theorems 1.5 and 1.6.

2 Variational Settings

For any given unite vector(direction) $e \in S^{N-1}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} &H^1 = W^{1,2}(R^1/Z, R^N), \\ &E_R = \{q \in H^1 |\ q(t+1/2) = -q(t), q(0) = q(1) = Re\}, \\ &\Lambda_R = \{q \in E_R |\ q(t) \ne 0, \forall t \in [0,1]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we just use R to denote the Euclidean length of $q(0)$ and $q(1)$. For any $q \in H^1$, we know that the following norms are equivalent to each other

$$\begin{aligned} \|q\|_{H^1} &= \left(\int_0^1 |\dot{q}(t)|^2 dt\right)^{1/2} + \left|\int_0^1 q(t) dt\right| \\ \|q\|_{H^1} &= \left(\int_0^1 |\dot{q}(t)|^2 dt\right)^{1/2} + \left(\int_0^1 |q(t)|^2 dt\right)^{1/2} \\ \|q\|_{H^1} &= \left(\int_0^1 |\dot{q}(t)|^2 dt\right)^{1/2} + |q(0)|. \end{aligned}$$

If $q \in \Lambda_R$, we have $\int_0^1 q(t) dt = 0$, then by Poincaré-Wirtinger's inequality, we obtain that above norms are equivalent to

$$\|q\|_{H^1} = \left(\int_0^1 |\dot{q}(t)|^2 dt\right)^{1/2}.$$

Let $L^\infty([0,1], R^N)$ be a space of measurable functions from $[0,1]$ into R^N and essentially bounded under the following norm

$$\|q\|_{L^\infty([0,1],R^N)} := esssup\{|q(t)| : t \in [0,1]\}.$$

Moreover, let $f:\ \Lambda_R \to R^1$ be the functional defined by

$$\begin{aligned} f(q) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 |\dot{q}(t)|^2 dt \int_0^1 (H - V(q(t))) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|q\|^2 \int_0^1 (H - V(q(t))) dt \end{aligned}$$

Then one can easily check that $f \in C^1(\Lambda_R, R^1)$ and

$$\langle f'(q), q(t) \rangle = \|q\|^2 \int_0^1 \Big(H - V(q(t)) - \frac{1}{2}(\nabla V(q(t)), q(t))\Big) dt.$$

Our way to get the hyperbolic orbit is by approaching it with a sequence of periodic solutions. Firstly, we prove the existence of the approximate solutions, then we study the limit procedure.

3 Existence of Periodic Solutions

The approximate solutions are obtained by the variational minimization methods. We need the following lemma which is proved by A. Ambrosetti and V. Coti. Zelati in [1].

Lemma 3.1(See[1]) *Let* $f(q) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 |\dot{q}(t)|^2 dt \int_0^1 (H - V(q(t)))dt$ *and* $\tilde{q} \in H^1$ *be such that* $f'(\tilde{q}) = 0$, $f(\tilde{q}) > 0$. *Set*

$$T^2 = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 |\dot{\tilde{q}}(t)|^2 dt}{\int_0^1 (H - V(\tilde{q}(t))dt}.$$

Then $\tilde{u}(t) = \tilde{q}(t/T)$ *is a non-constant* T*-periodic solution for (1) and (2).*

Lemma 3.2(Palais[18]) *Let* σ *be an orthogonal representation of a finite or compact group* G *in the real Hilbert space* H *such that for any* $\sigma \in G$,

$$f(\sigma \cdot x) = f(x),$$

where $f \in C^1(H, R^1)$. *Let* $S = \{x \in H | \sigma x = x, \forall \sigma \in G\}$, *then the critical point of* f *in* S *is also a critical point of* f *in* H.

Lemma 3.3(Translation Property[13]) *Suppose that, in domain* $D \subset R^N$, *we have a solution* $\phi(t)$ *for the following differential equation*

$$x^{(n)} + F(x^{(n-1)}, \cdots, x) = 0,$$

where $x^{(k)} = d^k x/dt^k$, $k = 0, 1, \cdots, n$, $x^{(0)} = x$. *Then* $\phi(t - t_0)$ *with* t_0 *being a constant is also a solution.*

In the following, we introduce *Gordon's Strong Force* condition.

Lemma 3.4(Gordon[8]) V *is said to satisfy Gordon's Strong Force condition, if there exists a neighborhood* $\mathcal{N}$ *of 0 and a function* $U \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$ *such that*
(i) $\lim_{x\to 0} U(x) = -\infty$;
(ii) $-V(x) \geq |U'(x)|^2$ for every $x \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

If V satisfies *Gordon's Strong Force* condition, then

$$\int_0^1 V(x_j)dt \to -\infty, \quad \forall\ x_j \rightharpoonup x \in \partial\Lambda_R.$$

Lemma 3.5 *Suppose* (V_2) *and* (V_4) *hold, then* V *satisfies Gordon's Strong Force condition.*

Proof. Let $\phi(r) = -V(r\widetilde{e})r^2$, where $r = |x|$, $\widetilde{e} = x/|x|$, then we have

$$\phi'(r) = -r(2V(r\widetilde{e}) + (\nabla V(r\widetilde{e}), r\widetilde{e})).$$

It follows from (V_4) that, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\phi'(r) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 < |x| \leq \delta.$$

Since $V \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$, we get

$$\phi(r) \;\; \geq \;\; \phi(\delta) = -V(\delta e)\delta^2 \geq \delta^2 \min_{|x|=\delta}(-V(x)).$$

It follows from the definition of ϕ and (V_2) that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$-V(x) \geq \frac{C}{|x|^2} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 < r \leq \delta.$$

We set $U(x) = \sqrt{C}\ln|x|$, then by some calculation, we obtain

$$\lim_{x\to 0} U(x) = -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad -V(x) \geq |U'(x)|^2 \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 < r \leq \delta,$$

which proves this lemma.

Lemma 3.6 *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 1.5 hold, then for any $R > 0$, there exists at least one periodic solution on Λ_R for the following systems*

$$\ddot{u}(t) + \nabla V(u(t)) = 0, \qquad \forall\, t \in \left(-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right) \tag{5}$$

with

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot{u}(t)|^2 + V(u(t)) = H, \qquad \forall\, t \in \left(-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right). \tag{6}$$

Proof. We notice that H^1 is a reflexive Banach space and E_R is a weakly closed subset of H^1. Since $H > 0$, we obtain that

$$f(q) \;\; = \;\; \frac{1}{2}\|q\|^2 \int_0^1 (H - V(q(t))dt \geq \frac{H}{2}\|q\|^2, \tag{7}$$

which implies that f is a functional bounded from below, furthermore, it is easy to check that f is weakly lower semi-continuous and

$$f(q) \to +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad \|q\| \to +\infty. \tag{8}$$

Then, we conclude that for every $R > 0$ there exists a minimizer $q_R \in E_R$ such that

$$f'(q_R) = 0, \qquad f(q_R) = \inf_{q\in E_R} f(q) > 0. \tag{9}$$

Furthermore, we need to prove that $q_R \in \Lambda_R$ which means q_R has no collision for any $R > 0$. Suppose that $\{q_j\}_{j\in N}$ is the minimizing sequence, then if q_R has collision, which means $q_R \in \partial\Lambda_R = \{q_R \in E_R |\ \exists\, t' \in [0,1]\ st.\ q_R(t') = 0\}$, we can prove that

$$f(q_j) \to +\infty, \quad \text{as} \quad j \to +\infty. \tag{10}$$

To prove this fact, there are two cases needed to be discussed.

Case 1. If q_R =constant, it follows from $q_R \in \partial\Lambda_R$ that $q_R \equiv 0$, which is a contradiction, since $|q_R(0)| = |q_R(1)| = R$.

Case 2. If $q_R \neq$constant, we have $\|q_R\|^2 = \int_0^1 |\dot{q}_R(t)|^2 dt > 0$, otherwise by $q_R(t + 1/2) = -q_R(t)$, we can deduce $q_R \equiv 0$ which is a contradiction. Then by the weakly-lower-semi-continuity of norm, we have

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \|q_j\| \geq \|q_R\| > 0.$$

Then by Lemma 3.4, (10) holds.

Moreover, let $Q(t) = R(\xi \cos(2\pi t) + \eta \sin(2\pi t)) \in \Lambda_R$, where $\xi, \eta \in R^N \setminus \{0\}$, $|\xi| = |\eta| = 1$, $(\xi, \eta) = 0$, which implies that $|Q(t)| = R$, $\|Q\| = 2\pi R$, hence

$$f(Q) \quad = \quad 2\pi^2 R^2 \left(H - \int_0^1 V(Q(t))dt \right).$$

Since $V \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$, then there exists a constant $M_{1,R} > 0$ such that $|V(Q(t))| \leq M_{1,R}$. We obtain that

$$f(q_R) \leq f(Q) \leq M_{2,R} \tag{11}$$

for some $M_{2,R} > 0$, but (11) contradicts with (10) for any fixed $R > 0$. Then we can see that $q_R \in \Lambda_R$ has no collision.

Let

$$T_R^2 = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 |\dot{q}_R(t)|^2 dt}{\int_0^1 (H - V(q_R(t))dt}.$$

Then by Lemma 3.1− Lemma 3.3, we obtain that $u_R(t) = q_R(\frac{t+\frac{T_R}{2}}{T_R}) : \left(-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right) \to \Lambda_R$ is a T_R-periodic solution for systems (5) and (6). The lemma is proved.

4 Blowing-up Argument

Subsequently, we need to show that $u_R(t)$ can not diverge to infinity uniformly as $R \to +\infty$. Moreover, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1 *Suppose that* $u_R(t) : \left(-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right) \to \Lambda_R$ *is the solution obtained in Lemma 3.6, then* $\min_{t\in\left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right]} |u_R(t)|$ *is bounded from above. More precisely, there is a constant* $M > 0$ *independent of* R *such that*

$$\min_{t\in\left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right]} |u_R(t)| \leq M \quad \textit{for all} \quad R > 0.$$

Proof. Since $q_R \in \Lambda_R$, it is easy to see that $u_R(t) = q_R(\frac{t+\frac{T_R}{2}}{T_R})$ satisfies $u_R(-\frac{T_R}{2}) = u_R(\frac{T_R}{2})$ and $\dot{u}_R(-\frac{T_R}{2}) = \dot{u}_R(\frac{T_R}{2})$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(u_R\left(\frac{T_R}{2}\right), \dot{u}_R\left(\frac{T_R}{2}\right)\right) - \left(u_R\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}\right), \dot{u}_R\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}\right)\right) \\
= &\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} \frac{d}{dt}(u_R(t), \dot{u}_R(t))dt \\
= &\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} (|\dot{u}_R(t)|^2 + (u_R(t), \ddot{u}_R(t)))dt \\
= &\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} 2(H - V(u_R(t))) - (\nabla V(u_R(t)), u_R(t))dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain that

$$\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} 2H - (2V(u_R(t)) + (\nabla V(u_R(t)), u_R(t)))dt = 0.$$

There are two cases needed to be discussed.

Case 1. $2H - (2V(u_R(t)) + (\nabla V(u_R(t)), u_R(t))) \equiv 0$, which implies that

$$2H \quad = \quad 2V(u_R(t)) + (\nabla V(u_R(t)), u_R(t)), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in \left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right].$$

Hypothesis (V_3) implies that there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ independent of R such that

$$\min_{t\in\left[-\frac{T_R}{2},\frac{T_R}{2}\right]} |u_R(t)| \leq M_1.$$

Case 2. $2(H - V(u_R(t))) - (\nabla V(u_R(t)), u_R(t))$ changes sign in $\left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right]$. Then there exists $t_0 \in \left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right]$ such that

$$2H - (2V(u_R(t_0)) + (\nabla V(u_R(t_0)), u_R(t_0))) < 0,$$

which implies that

$$2H \quad < \quad 2V(u_R(t_0)) + (\nabla V(u_R(t_0)), u_R(t_0)).$$

It follows from hypothesis (V_3) that there exists a constant $M_2 > 0$ independent of R such that

$$\min_{t\in\left[-\frac{T_R}{2},\frac{T_R}{2}\right]} |u_R(t)| \leq M_2.$$

Then the proof is completed.

5 Proof of Theorem 1.5

The ideas for the following proofs in this section mostly comes from Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 4.1 in [7], we write out them for completeness.

Lemma 5.1 *Suppose that $u_R(t)$ is the solution for* $(5) - (6)$ *obtained in Lemma 3.6. Then there exists a constant $m > 0$ independent of R such that*

$$\min_{t\in\left[-\frac{T_R}{2},\frac{T_R}{2}\right]} |u_R(t)| \geq m.$$

Proof. Since $u_R(t)$ is a solution for system $(5) - (6)$, then we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\frac{1}{2}|u_R(t)|^2 &= \frac{d}{dt}(u_R(t), \dot{u}_R(t)) \\ &= |\dot{u}_R(t)|^2 + (u_R(t), \ddot{u}_R(t)) \\ &= 2(H - V(u_R(t))) - (\nabla V(u_R(t)), u_R(t)) \quad t \in \left(-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\left|u_R\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}\right)\right| = \left|u_R\left(\frac{T_R}{2}\right)\right| = R$, then using hypothesis (V_4), we can find $m \in (0,1)$ independent of R such that, for any $t \in \{t \in \left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right] \mid \max_{t\in\left[-\frac{T_R}{2},\frac{T_R}{2}\right]} |u_R(t)| \le m\}$,

$$2H - (2V(u_R(t)) + (\nabla V(u_R(t)), u_R(t))) < 0,$$

which implies that $|u_R(t)|$ is concave when $|u_R(t)| \le m$ and $|u_R(t)|$ cannot take a local minimum such that $\max_{t\in\left[-\frac{T_R}{2},\frac{T_R}{2}\right]} |u_R(t)| \le m$, which implies that

$$|u_R(t)| \ge m \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right].$$

If not, we can assume that there exists a $\overline{t} \in \left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right]$ such that $|u_R(\overline{t})| < m$, then we can easily check that $|u_R(t)|$ takes a local minimum at some $\tilde{t}$ with $|u_R(\tilde{t})| < m$, which is a contradiction. Then we obtain the conclusion.

Lemma 5.2 *Suppose that $R > M$, where M is defined in Lemma 4.1 and $u_R(t)$ is the solution for* $(5)-(6)$ *obtained in Lemma 3.6. Set*

$$t_+ = \sup\left\{t \in \left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right] \mid |u_R(t)| \le L\right\}$$

and

$$t_- = \inf\left\{t \in \left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right] \mid |u_R(t)| \le L\right\}$$

where L is a constant independent of R such that $M < L < R$. Then we have that

$$\frac{T_R}{2} - t_+ \to +\infty, \quad t_- + \frac{T_R}{2} \to +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad R \to +\infty.$$

Proof. By the definition of $u_R(t)$ we have that

$$\left|u_R\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}\right)\right| = \left|u_R\left(\frac{T_R}{2}\right)\right| = R.$$

Then, by (V_2) and the definitions of t_+ and t_-, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{t_+}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} \sqrt{H - V(u_R(t))}|\dot{u}_R(t)|dt &\ge \sqrt{H}\int_{t_+}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} |\dot{u}_R(t)|dt \\ &\ge \sqrt{H}\left|\int_{t_+}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} \dot{u}_R(t)dt\right| \ge \sqrt{H}(R-L) \qquad (12)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{t_-} \sqrt{H - V(u_R(t))}|\dot{u}_R(t)|dt &\ge \sqrt{H}\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{t_-} |\dot{u}_R(t)|dt \\ &\ge \sqrt{H}\left|\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{t_-} \dot{u}_R(t)dt\right| \ge \sqrt{H}(R-L). \qquad (13)\end{aligned}$$

Since $V \in C^1(R^N \setminus \{0\}, R^1)$, it follows from Lemma 5.1 and (V_6), that there exists a constant $M_3 > 0$ independent of R such that

$$|V(u_R(t))| \le M_3 \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \left[-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2}\right],$$

which implies that

$$\int_{t_+}^{\frac{T_R}{2}}\sqrt{H-V(u_R(t))}|\dot{u}_R(t)|dt=\sqrt{2}\int_{t_+}^{\frac{T_R}{2}}(H-V(u_R(t)))dt\le\sqrt{2}(H+M_3)\left(\frac{T_R}{2}-t_+\right).$$

Combining (12) with the above estimates, we obtain that

$$\sqrt{H}(R-L)\le\sqrt{2}(H+M_3)\left(\frac{T_R}{2}-t_+\right).$$

Then we have

$$\frac{T_R}{2}-t_+\to+\infty,\quad \text{as}\ \ R\to+\infty.$$

The limit for $t_-+\frac{T_R}{2}$ can be obtained in the similar way. The proof is completed.

Subsequently, we set that

$$t^*=\inf\left\{t\in\left[-\frac{T_R}{2},\frac{T_R}{2}\right]||u_R(t)|=M\right\} \tag{14}$$

and

$$u_R^*(t)=u_R(t-t^*).$$

Since $L>M$, we can deduce that $t_+\ge t^*\ge t_-$, which implies that

$$-\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*\to-\infty,\qquad \frac{T_R}{2}+t^*\to+\infty\ \ \text{as}\ \ R\to\infty.$$

Then it follows from (6) that

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot{u}_R^*(t)|^2+V(u_R^*(t))=H,\quad \forall\ t\in\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*,\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*\right),$$

which implies that

$$|\dot{u}_R^*(t)|^2=2(H-V(u_R^*(t))),\quad \forall\ t\in\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*,\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*\right).$$

By Lemma 5.1, (V_6) and $V\in C^1(R^N\backslash\{0\},R^1)$, we can deduce that there exists a constant $M_4>0$ independent of R such that

$$|V(u_R^*(t))|\le M_4\quad \text{for all}\ \ t\in\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*,\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*\right).$$

Then there is a constant $M_5>0$ independent of R such that

$$|\dot{u}_R^*(t)|\le M_5\quad \text{for all}\ \ t\in\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*,\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*\right).$$

which implies that

$$|u_R^*(t_1)-u_R^*(t_2)|\le\left|\int_{t_2}^{t_1}\dot{u}_R^*(s)ds\right|\le\int_{t_2}^{t_1}|\dot{u}_R^*(s)|\,ds\le M_5|t_1-t_2| \tag{15}$$

for each $R>0$ and $t_1,t_2\in\left(-\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*,\frac{T_R}{2}+t^*\right)$, which shows $\{u_R^*\}$ is equicontinuous. Then there is a subsequence $\{u_R^*\}_{R>0}$ converging to u_∞ in $C_{loc}(R^1,R^N)$. Then there exists a function $u_\infty(t)$ such that

(i) $u_R^*(t)\to u_\infty(t)$ in $C_{loc}(R^1,R^N)$
(ii)$|u_\infty(t)|\to+\infty$ as $|t|\to+\infty$

and $u_\infty(t)$ satisfies systems $(1)-(2)$. Then we finish the proof of Theorem 1.5.

6 Proof of Theorem 1.6

By the conditions of Theorem 1.6, the existence of hyperbolic solutions for systems (1) – (2) can be obtained with a similar proof of Theorem 1.5. Subsequently, we give the proof of the asymptotic direction of hyperbolic solutions at infinity. The proof is similar to Felmer and Tanaka's in [7].

Lemma 6.1 *Suppose that $u_R(t)$ is the solution for (5) – (6) obtained in Lemma 3.6. Then there exists a constant $M_6 > 0$ independent of $R > 1$ such that*

$$\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} \sqrt{H - V(u_R(t))}|\dot{u}_R(t)|dt \leq \sqrt{2H}R + M_6.$$

Proof. Firstly, we define the function $\xi(t)$ on $[1, +\infty)$ as a solution of

$$\begin{aligned}&\dot{\xi}(t) = \sqrt{2(H - V(\xi(t)e))}\\ &\xi(1) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

And $\tau_R > 1$ is a real number such that $\xi(\tau_R) = R$. We can define $\xi(t)$ in $(-\infty, 0]$ and τ_{-R} in a similar way. Then we can fix $\varphi(t) \in H^1([0,1], R^N)$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_R(t) \in \Lambda_R$ where

$$\tilde{\gamma}_R(t) = \gamma_R(t(\tau_R - \tau_{-R}) + \tau_{-R}), \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_R(t) = \begin{cases} \xi(t)e & \text{for } t \in [1, \tau_R] \bigcup [\tau_{-R}, 0] \\ \varphi(t) & \text{for } t \in [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Subsequently, we set $u_r(t) = \tilde{\gamma}_R(\frac{t+r}{2r})$. And it is easy to see that $u_r(t) = \gamma_R(t)$ if $\pm r = \tau_{\pm R}$. Similar to [7], we can deduce that for $r > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}(2f(\tilde{\gamma}_R))^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \inf_{r>0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{-r}^{r} \frac{1}{2}|\dot{u}_r(t)|^2 + H - V(u_r(t))dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{-\tau_R}^{\tau_R} \frac{1}{2}|\dot{\gamma}_R(t)|^2 + H - V(\gamma_R(t))dt. \qquad (16)\end{aligned}$$

Since $[-\tau_R, \tau_R] = [-\tau_R, 0] \bigcup [0,1] \bigcup [1, \tau_R]$, then by (V_7), we can estimate (16) by three integral. Firstly, we estimate the integral on $[1, \tau_R]$, which is

$$\begin{aligned}I_{[1,\tau_R]} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_1^{\tau_R} \frac{1}{2}|\dot{\gamma}_R(t)|^2 + H - V(\gamma_R(t))dt \\ &= \int_1^{\tau_R} \sqrt{H - V(\xi(t)e)}\dot{\xi}(t)dt \\ &= \int_1^R \sqrt{H - V(se)}ds \\ &\leq \int_1^R \sqrt{H} + \sqrt{-V(se)}ds \\ &= \sqrt{H}(R-1) + \int_1^{r_0} \sqrt{-V(se)}ds + \int_{r_0}^R \sqrt{-V(se)}ds \\ &\leq \sqrt{H}(R-1) + M_4(r_0 - 1) + \sqrt{M_0} \int_{r_0}^R s^{-\frac{\beta+1}{2}}ds \\ &\leq \sqrt{H}(R-1) + M_4(r_0 - 1) + \sqrt{M_0} \int_{r_0}^{+\infty} s^{-\frac{\beta+1}{2}}ds \\ &\leq \sqrt{H}R + M_7\end{aligned}$$

for some $M_7 > 0$ independent of $R \geq 1$. Similarly, we can get

$$I_{[\tau_R,0]} \leq \sqrt{H}R + M_7.$$

Since $I_{[0,1]}$ is independent of R, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{-\tau_R}^{\tau_R} \frac{1}{2}|\dot{\gamma}_R(t)|^2 + H - V(\gamma_R(t))dt \leq 2\sqrt{H}R + M_6$$

for some $M_6 > 0$ independent of R. Then by (16) and $q(t)$ is the minimizer of f on Λ_R, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} \sqrt{H - V(u_R(t))}|\dot{u}_R(t)|dt &\leq \left(\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} H - V(u_R(t))dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{-\frac{T_R}{2}}^{\frac{T_R}{2}} |\dot{u}_R(t)|^2 dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= (2f(q))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq (2f(\tilde{\gamma}_R))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{-\tau_R}^{\tau_R} \frac{1}{2}|\dot{\gamma}_R(t)|^2 + H - V(\gamma_R(t))dt \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{H}R + M_6. \qquad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

Then we finish the proof of this lemma.

Similar to Felmer and Tanaka [7], we set

$$A(t) = \sqrt{|u_R(t)|^2|\dot{u}_R(t)|^2 - (u_R(t), \dot{u}_R(t))^2}$$

and

$$\omega(t) = \frac{A(t)}{|u_R(t)||\dot{u}_R(t)|}.$$

Using the motion and energy equations, we have

$$|\dot{A}(t)| \leq |u_R(t)||\nabla V(u_R(t))|$$

and

$$\frac{d\omega}{dt} = \frac{2}{|u_R(t)||\dot{u}_R(t)|}(-\omega\sqrt{1-\omega^2}sign(u_R(t), \dot{u}_R(t))(H - V(u_R(t))) + |u_R(t)||\nabla V(u_R(t))|).$$

The proof of the following lemma is the same as [7].

Lemma 6.2(See[7]) *Assume u_R is a solution for $(5)-(6)$ obtained in Lemma 3.6. For any $\eta \in (0,1)$, there exists a $L_\eta \geq m$ such that if*

$$|u_R(t_0)| \geq L_\eta, \quad (u_R(t_0), \dot{u}_R(t_0)) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(t_0) < \eta \qquad (18)$$

for some $t_0 \in (-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2})$, then we have for $t \in [t_0, \frac{T_R}{2}]$

(i). $\omega(t) < \eta$,

(ii). $\frac{d}{dt}|u_R(t)| \geq \sqrt{1-\eta^2}|\dot{u}_R(t)|$,

(iii). $\frac{d}{dt}|u_R(t)| \geq \sqrt{2(1-\eta^2)H}$,

(iv). $|u_R(t)| \geq |u_R(t_0)| + \sqrt{2(1-\eta^2)H}(t - t_0)$.

Lemma 6.3(See[7]) *Let* u_R *is a solution for* $(5)-(6)$ *obtained in Lemma 3.6 satisfying (18) and* $|u_R(t)| \geq r_0$ *with* $t \geq t_0$ *for certain* $t_0 \in (-\frac{T_R}{2}, \frac{T_R}{2})$ *with* $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ *and* L_η *as in Lemma 6.2. Then for* $t \geq t_0$ *we have*

$$\left|\frac{u_R(t)}{|u_R(t)|} - \frac{u_R(t_0)}{|u_R(t_0)|}\right| \leq M_8\eta + \frac{M_9}{|u_R(t_0)|^\beta},$$

where M_8, $M_9 > 0$ are independent of η, $u_R(t)$ and t_0.

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, (iii) of Lemma 6.2 and (V_7), we can estimate $A(t)$ as following.

$$\begin{aligned}
A(t) &\leq A(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t |u_R(s)||\nabla V(u_R(s))|ds \\
&\leq A(t_0) + \frac{M_9}{\sqrt{2(1-\eta^2)H}} \int_{t_0}^t |u_R(s)||\nabla V(u_R(s))| \frac{d}{ds}|u_R(s)|ds \\
&\leq A(t_0) + \frac{M_9}{\sqrt{2(1-\eta^2)H}} \int_{|u_R(t_0)|}^{|u_R(t)|} \varphi \left|\nabla V\left(\varphi \frac{u_R(s)}{|u_R(s)|}\right)\right| d\varphi \\
&\leq A(t_0) + \frac{M_9 M_0}{\sqrt{2(1-\eta^2)H}} \int_{|u_R(t_0)|}^{|u_R(t)|} \frac{1}{\varphi^\beta} d\varphi \\
&\leq A(t_0) + \frac{M_9 M_0}{\sqrt{2(1-\eta^2)H}(\beta-1)} \frac{1}{|u_R(t_0)|^{\beta-1}} \\
&\leq A(t_0) + \frac{M_{10}}{|u_R(t_0)|^{\beta-1}} \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

for some $M_{10} > 0$ independent of R. Since we have

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}\frac{u_R(t)}{|u_R(t)|}\right| = \frac{A(t)}{|u_R(t)|^2}, \qquad (20)$$

then it follows from (iii) of Lemma 6.2, (19) and (20) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{u_R(t)}{|u_R(t)|} - \frac{u_R(t_0)}{|u_R(t_0)|}\right| &\leq \int_{t_0}^t \frac{A(s)}{|u_R(s)|^2} ds \\
&\leq \left(A(t_0) + \frac{M_{10}}{|u_R(t_0)|^{\beta-1}}\right) \int_{t_0}^t \frac{1}{|u_R(s)|^2} ds \\
&\leq \left(A(t_0) + \frac{M_{10}}{|u_R(t_0)|^{\beta-1}}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1-\eta^2)H}} \int_{t_0}^t \frac{1}{|u_R(s)|^2} \frac{d}{ds}|u_R(s)|ds \\
&\leq \left(A(t_0) + \frac{M_{10}}{|u_R(t_0)|^{\beta-1}}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1-\eta^2)H}} \frac{1}{|u_R(t_0)|}.
\end{aligned}$$

By energy equation and the definition of t_0, we have

$$A(t_0) = \omega(t_0)|u_R(t_0)||\dot{u}_R(t_0)| \leq \eta |u_R(t_0)| \sqrt{2(H - V(u_R(t_0)))},$$

which implies that for some M_8, $M_9 > 0$ independent of R

$$\left|\frac{u_R(t)}{|u_R(t)|} - \frac{u_R(t_0)}{|u_R(t_0)|}\right| \leq M_8\eta + \frac{M_9}{|u_R(t_0)|^\beta},$$

which proves this lemma.

Since we have Theorems 6.1-6.3, similar to [7], we have the following theorem.

Lemma 6.4(See[7]) *For any* $\varepsilon > 0$*, there exists* $M_{11} > 0$ *such that for* $R > M_{11}$

$$u_R\left(\left[t^*, \frac{T_R}{2}\right]\right) \bigcap \{|x| \geq M_{11}\} \subset \left\{y \in R^N : \left|\frac{y}{|y|} - e\right| < \varepsilon\right\},$$

where e is the given direction defined in E_R and t^* is defined as (14).

Let $\overline{t} \geq t^*$ such that $|u_R(\overline{t})| = \overline{L}_\eta$. Then we can get for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\left|\frac{u_R(t)}{|u_R(t)|} - e\right| < \varepsilon \tag{21}$$

for all $t \geq \bar{t}$, which implies that

$$\frac{u_\infty(t)}{|u_\infty(t)|} \to e \quad \text{as} \quad t \to +\infty$$

and

$$\frac{u_\infty(t)}{|u_\infty(t)|} \to e \quad \text{as} \quad t \to -\infty.$$

From the above discussion, we have proved there is at least one hyperbolic solution for $(1) - (2)$ with $H > 0$ which has the given asymptotic direction at infinity. We finish the proof. □

Acknowledgements

The authors sincerely thank the referees for his/her many valuable comments and remarks which make the paper more simple and clear.

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti and V. Coti Zelati, Closed orbits of fixed energy for singular Hamiltonian systems, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 112(1990), 339-362.

[2] A. Ambrosetti and V. Coti Zelati, Periodic solutions for singular Lagrangian systems, Springer, 1993.

[3] V. Barutello, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini. Entire parabolic trajectories as minimal phase transitions. Preprint, arXiv:1105.3358v1 [math.DS], 2011.

[4] G.Cerami, Un criterio di esistenza per i punti critici su varietà illimitate, Rend. Acad. Sci. Lett. Ist. Lombardo 112(1978), 332-336.

[5] K.C. Chang, Infinite dimensional Morse theory and multiple solution problems, Birkhauser, 1993.

[6] M.Degiovanni and F.Giannoni, Periodic solutions of dynamical systems with Newtonian type potentials, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. 15(1988), 467-494.

[7] P. Felmer, K. Tanaka, Hyperbolic-like solutions for singular Hamiltonian systems, Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. 7 (2000) 43-65.

[8] W. Gordon, Conservative dynamical systems involving strong forces, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 204(1975)., 113-135.

[9] Y. Lv, C. L. Tang, Existence of even homoclinic orbits for second-order Hamiltonian systems, Nonlinear Anal. 67 (2007), no. 7, 2189–2198.

[10] M. Izydorek, J. Janczewska, Homoclinic solutions for nonautonomous second-order Hamiltonian systems with a coercive potential, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 335 (2007), no. 2, 1119–1127.

[11] J. Mawhin, M. Willem, Critical Point Theory and Hamiltonian systems, Appl. Math. Sci., vol. 74, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.

[12] E. Maderna, A. Venturelli, Globally minimizing parabolic motions in the Newtonian N-body problem, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 194 (2009), 283-313.

[13] F. Verhulst, Nonlinear Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1990.

[14] P. H. Rabinowitz, Homoclinic orbits for a class of Hamiltonian systems, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 114 (1990) 33-38.

[15] P. H. Rabinowitz, Periodic and Heteroclinic orbits for a periodic Hamiltonian system, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire 6 (5) (1989) 331-346.

[16] E. Serra, Homoclinic orbits at infinity for second order conservative systems, Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. 1 (1994), 249-266.

[17] E. Serra, S. Terracini, Noncollision solutions to some singular minimization problems with Keplerian-like potentials, Nonlinear Anal. TMA 22(1994), 45-62.

[18] R. Palais, The principle of symmetric criticality, CMP 69(1979), 19-30.

[19] D. L. Wu, X. P. Wu, C. L. Tang, Homoclinic solutions for a class of nonperiodic and noneven second-order Hamiltonian systems, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 367 (2010) 154-166.

[20] P. F. Yuan, S. Q. Zhang, New Periodic Solutions for N-body Problems with Weak Force Potentials, Bollettino U.M.I.(9) V (2012).

[21] S. Q. Zhang, Symmetrically homoclinic orbits for symmetric Hamiltonian systems, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 247 (2) (2000) 645-652.

[22] S. Q. Zhang, Variational Minimizing Parabolic and Hyperbolic Orbits for the Restricted 3-Body Problems, Sci. China, doi: 10.1007/s11425-011-4311-9.